

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/675,430	CHAVANNE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kambiz Zand	2132	

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) Kambiz Zand.

(3) _____.

 (2) Sheryl Sue Holloway.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 July 2005
Time: 2:45 PM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1-44

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner initially contacted the Applicant's attorney on 07/08/2005 informing them that the Applicant's response arguments relate to claims 2, 10, 13, 21, 25, 32, 36 and 43 and if applicant incorporate the mentioned claims into their respective independent claims and based on the outcome of the final search the independent claims may be allowed.

Ms Sheryl Sue holloway in a follow up interview on 07/12/2005 informed examiner of the following:

- a) a Final rejection be mailed, since the claims as it written do not clearly points out Applicant's invention and the objected claims mentioned earlier only represent one embodiment relating to fig.3c, and even that is not written as clearly as intended for.
- b) Examiner also was informed that upon receive of the final rejection an RCE will be filed with new set of claims that is representable of Applicant's invention in very clear language where the IV is consist of information from each block of data and just not as the combination of the seed value from each block.

Therefore examiner agreed with applicant's attorney for sending the final rejection as it is requested..